

I-343 Steven Scriven (2)

- I-343-1** The comment introduces the following comments related to impacts on local streets due to school community from the proposed Project.

The County acknowledges the comment as an introduction to comments that follow. This comment is included in the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-343-2** The comment states the commenter attended a joint meeting between the San Marcos City Council and the Unified School District at which “the general info obtained...is that all the schools in the area are over capacity.” The comment states the school board stated that “no contiguous acreage exists in the area to build more schools” and “the money is not there to improve the schools that existing.” The comment states “this is happening fast and is project to double in the next 10 years.”

The County notes the comment provides factual background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The comment addresses general subject areas (school service), which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 3.5, Public Services. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

- I-343-3** The comment provides an example in San Elijo Hills, a master planned community of over 5,000 homes, and states that the local streets in San Marcos are inundated with school traffic during the morning and afternoon hours, and that “it can take 30 minutes just to leave the neighborhood near San Marcos High School because of the overflow of traffic from the school.”

The County notes the comment provides factual background information and does not raise an environmental issue within the meaning of CEQA. The comment addresses general subject areas (Traffic), which received extensive analysis in the Draft EIR, specifically in Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic. The comment does not raise any specific issue regarding that analysis and, therefore, no more specific response can be provided or is required.

Comment Letter Responses

The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required because the comment does not raise an environmental issue concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

- I-343-4** The comment states the proposed Project will “create a huge influx of students into the surrounding areas into schools and roads that cannot support them.” The County acknowledges the comment and notes it expresses the opinions of the commentator, and does not raise an issue related to the adequacy of any specific section or analysis of the Draft EIR.

The County directs the commenter to Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, which analyzes the proposed Project’s traffic impacts in the AM and PM peak hours, as required by the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance. As the commenter does not identify which specific roadways “cannot support” the additional trips from the proposed Project, the County cannot offer any more specific response. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-343-5** The comment asks if the project Applicant will be required to implement any other mitigation other than school fees. The County acknowledges the comment and notes that traffic impacts are required to be mitigated in accordance with the mitigation measures identified in Section 2.13.12. As the commenter does not identify which specific roadways “cannot support” the additional trips from the proposed Project, the County cannot offer any more specific response. The County will include the comment as part of the Final EIR for review and consideration by the decision-makers prior to a final decision on the project. No further response is required or necessary.

- I-343-6** The comment states that since students from the proposed project will be taking a car to school, “why is it the projection for the affected streets in the EIR say only Twin Oaks Valley Road will be affected by traffic when these cars spill over onto San Marcos Blvd, 78 freeway and mission rd. for the school access?”

The County directs the commenter to Section 2.13, Transportation and Traffic, which analyzes the proposed Project’s traffic impacts in the AM and PM peak hours, as required by the County’s Guidelines for Determining Significance. All street segments which were identified to carry sufficient peak hour trips were included in the traffic analysis.

Comment Letter Responses

The County notes that the DEIR studied the intersection of Mission Road/Vineyard Road, three intersection of San Marcos Boulevard, and does identify impacts to SR-78 (TR-42).

- I-343-7** The County acknowledges the comment and notes it provides concluding remarks that do not raise new or additional environmental issues concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR. For that reason, the County provides no further response to this comment.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK